

The idea that the hijacked aircraft were swapped on 9/11 is not uncommon in the Truth community. When I first heard about it, I was skeptical. What would be the point of swapping planes in mid-air?

One explanation I heard is that the real, registered aircraft which were "hijacked" flew over military bases (I believe Stewart Air Force Base, which was closed?), possibly landed there and had drone, or remote-controlled flights replace them. These drones would crash into the Towers and possibly the Pentagon, if you believe a plane crashed there.

Aircraft swaps are also discussed in the famous *Operation Northwoods* document, and is also a reason why the theory finds some acceptance.

[After reading the work of "Woody Box"](#), I think aircraft swaps were not only *likely used* on 9/11, but were also integral to the success of the false flag.

Woody Box describes his work as "mainly journalistic, but strongly [pointing] to a [false flag]." He further states that his research "validates and brings together two concepts":

- The possibility of changing the identity of an airborne aircraft, at first proposed by A.K. Dewdney;
- The transformation of mere "military drills" into deadly, real world attacks, achieved by small modifications of the original exercises, as proposed by Webster Tarpley (who I quote later to illustrate this point).

He writes that the tying of these two concepts, "refutes the often-expressed impossibility of performing a gigantic false flag operation like the 9/11 attacks without having thousands of co-conspirators."

Below follows why I think aircraft swaps were used. (Pretty long)

Basically, false flag planners face three major problems. There's a need to maintain secrecy, and also a need for plausible deniability on the operational level. There's also the third problem: how to convince people ignorant of your illegal operation, that what they think happened (in this case, a hijacking) really happened. Because military drills are usually classified, there's a good way to maintain secrecy from the public. But how about keeping an operation safe from your ignorant, non-corrupt colleagues? After all, that's a major objection to the idea of conspiracy. "If too many people know, *the secret will leak out!*"

Tarpley writes in his book, *9/11: Synthetic Terror*, that rogue operatives take advantage of legitimate channels to conduct their operations:

Staff exercises or command exercises are perfect for a rogue network **which is forced to conduct its operations using the same communications and computer systems used by other officers who are not necessarily party to the illegal operation**, coup or provocation as it may be.

A putschist officer may be working at a console next to another officer who is not in on the coup, and who might indeed oppose it if he knew about it. The putschist's behavior is suspicious: "What the hell is he doing?" The loyal officer looks over and asks the putschist about it. The putschist cites a staff maneuver for which he is preparing.

The loyal officer concludes that the putschist's activities are part of an officially sanctioned drill, and his suspicions are allayed. The putschist may even explain that participation in the staff exercise requires a special security clearance which the loyal officer does not have. The conversation ends, and the putschist can go on with his treasonous work.¹

The aircraft swap *is* in large part the "...modification of the 'original exercise', the transition point from mere simulation to real world attack. This is how the concepts of terror drill and aircraft swaps, in the case of 9/11, are tied together.

Think of it like this: If there were no hijackers, we can assume the flights which hit the Towers were drones; after all, what else would steer them into their targets? If there were no hijackers, then that element of a narrative is a fabrication. But why are we told about "hijackers" specifically? That information was not revealed to us after the attacks unfolded; it was immediately clear after the second plane strike that it was a deliberate attack. Indeed, we know about the hijackers thanks to the mistaken broadcasts from the alleged flights which hit the Towers, and the phone calls from passengers.

The key point is that the "hijacker" fabrication isn't an afterthought. The evidence we have to support the idea of hijackers on flights are ultimately the product of a military exercise, specifically a terror drill. The US military is on record of hosting drills which envision mythical al-Qaeda enemies sworn to attacking the American homeland. Regular exercises are "sand-boxed" so that the operations of the staff conducting the "terror drill" don't interfere with normal operations (e.g. flight controllers working civilian flights). Normally, this is what happens.

However, we must keep in mind that exercises also take place on the same platforms used by regular staffers, as noted by Tarpley. We see an example of this in the Boston NEADS attache who helped conduct war games, Colin Scoggins.

A false flag "exercise" looking to escape its sand-box cannot simply branch out into the real world with the same assets, especially if it's a "live fly"--meaning not mere tabletop, but a simulation with physical assets in a controlled airspace. That poses safety and security risks, knowing the objectives of such exercises.

The solution, then, is to *duplicate* an asset and *invert* its role in the exercise. That is, one "asset" is assigned a role closer to a "simulation" on one end, and the other asset is assigned a sacrificial role on the other end...In the case of 9/11, rather than fly a plane in exercise status into the Trade Center (which would give away your plan immediately), you would assign a drone as the duplicated asset, which would continue on to its target. These two roles together bring the "hijacker" narrative to fruition; a "simulation" of sorts on one end and the devastating attack (with a drone flight) on the other end.

There is compelling evidence that senior managers at American Airlines knew that a drill concerning a hijacked plane would take place on September 11th. This doesn't mean it was aware of the broader false flag element, but the guise of a military drill secured its participation. In addition, because the scenario looks much like a military drill, it a good method to maintain secrecy; and indeed senior managers at American Airlines wanted others to keep quiet about the "operation".

¹Webster Tarpley, *Synthetic Terror* (2005), p. 188.

Furthermore, a researcher named *LoopDLoop* has pored through many 9/11 Commission documents and FBI interviews. From these interviews and other primary source material, he concluded that the flight crew of American 11 was deceived into taking part in a “terror drill”, which was merely a ruse to fabricate support for the idea of hijackers on the doomed flights. He supplies ample evidence that picocells—which allow reception to a cell tower—were installed in the plane the flight crew was phoning from. This indicates foreknowledge and elements of a false flag. His work is outside the scope of our present discussion, but I will reference it for interested readers.

In summary, duplication is a good way to maneuver assets that are currently in use in an exercise which is apparently “only” a simulation, whilst minimizing the danger of the deeper operation leaking out. For rogue operatives who are forced to use the same “communications and computer systems” as their law abiding colleagues, it seemed to work pretty well on September 11th.

We can think of the “hijacking” portion of the false flag as a multi-layered operation. Logically, you can’t exactly duplicate another flight, but rather you duplicate certain features that you want others who *aren’t* privy to your operation to see.

For instance, air traffic controllers generally do not have the equipment to detect the origin of a radio call—what’s called “radio direction finding”. We know this from 9/11 itself – Cleveland ATC initially mistook screams overheard from Flight 93 for a hijacking on Delta 1989, which was approx. 25 miles away from Flight 93 at that time. Delta 1989 was later confirmed a “non-hijack”.

There's standard telephony to ensure that each flight identifies their selves properly. If you're a rogue operative however, you take that weakness to your advantage. No air traffic controller can verify who you claim to be. Hence, you can have a pilot pretend to fly another plane by simply identifying itself as such to the controller.

Ordinarily (in a one flight scenario reporting a hijack) this would never work, since for the four hijacked flights, the controller would still see the primary radar returns of the craft following their alleged crashes. Or he'd wonder how a hijack is taking place if there are no serious deviations from the flight plan. It would also be difficult to convert the original flights into drones.

However, with one “fake flight” phoning in a hijack (not traceable), and with another dedicated drone that identifies via transponder as the hijacked flight (traceable), you can “swap” these planes at a certain point (with some trickery) so that a controller believes a flight has crashed.

This solves three problems for false flag planners: the problem of secrecy (the so-called “drill” is classified and requires need-to-know), the problem of plausible deniability (using assets for your operation without getting caught), and perhaps most importantly, tricking others *not* privy to your operation into thinking something has happened when it hasn't (the hijackings).

Thanks so much for reading! Any comments, questions or criticism welcome :)